Amendments to the Drawings

Applicants hereby delete Figures 4 and 5 from the application.

REMARKS

By the above amendments, applicant has: (i) canceled claims 1-8, and 14 without prejudice; (ii) amended claims 9-15; and (iii) added new claims 16 and 17. No new matter has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claims 7, 8, 10, and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: lack of antecedent basis and/or improper dependency.

Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled without prejudice, and the objections relating thereto are now moot.

Claim 10 has been amended to depend from claim 9, and to clearly refer to elements described in claim 9. Therefore, it is believed that amended claim 10 overcomes the objection, and should be allowable.

Claim 14 has been canceled, and the objection relating thereto is now moot.

Claim 15 is objected to because of awkward and confusing wording. Appropriate corrections have been made to claim 15. It is believed that amended claim 15 overcomes the objection, and should be allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-7, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,899,552 "Yokoyama").

Claims 1-7 have been canceled, and the rejections relating thereto are now moot.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as to claim 9 as follows:

Amended claim 9 recites "[a] liquid crystal display, comprising: a diffusion board having an emitting surface and **an incident surface opposite to the emitting surface**; and a light source arranged behind the incident surface; wherein the diffusion board forms an ordinary diffusion section and an intensified diffusion section, **the intensified diffusion section having a refractive index higher than that of the ordinary diffusion section, and corresponding to the light source in shape and position**, thereby eliminating a "shadow" image of the light source when viewed from the liquid crystal display."

Amended claim 9 comprises a new limitation that the incident surface is opposite to the emitting surface. This new limitation is disclosed in detail in the specification and Figure 1 of the present application.

Yokoyama discloses a liquid crystal display comprising a diffusion board having an emitting surface and an incident surface **adjacent to the emitting surface**; and a light source arranged beside the incident surface; wherein the diffusion board forms an ordinary diffusion section (E2) and an intensified diffusion section (E1, E2<E1), **the ordinary diffusion section (E2) corresponding to the light source in position**.

Applicant asserts that in Yokoyama, (i) the incident surface is adjacent to the emitting surface, and (ii) the ordinary diffusion section corresponds to the light

source in position. However, in amended claim 9, (i) the incident surface is opposite to the emitting surface, and (ii) the intensified diffusion section has a large refractive index and corresponds to the light source in shape and position. Yokoyama's structure is fundamentally different from that of the present invention, and Yokoyama does not teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that he or she might or should provide the liquid crystal display of amended claim 9. Furthermore, the liquid crystal display as recited in amended claim 9 produces new and unexpected results. That is, the "shadow" image of the light source when viewed from the liquid crystal display is eliminated. Accordingly, amended claim 9 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable over Yokoyama under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as to claim 15 as follows:

Amended claim 15 recites "[a] liquid crystal display comprising: a backlight module including a plurality of light sources emitting light toward a diffusion plate, wherein said diffusion plate defines at least first and second types of regions thereof, **of which the first type of region faces a corresponding adjacent light source in a perpendicular manner while the second type of region faces one or more corresponding adjacent light sources in an oblique manner, under a condition that a diffusion capability of the first type of region is greater than that of the second type of region**."

Yokoyama discloses a liquid crystal display having a backlight module (see Figure 6) including a plurality of light sources (12) emitting light toward a diffusion plate (11), wherein the diffusion plate defines at least first and second types of regions (E2, E1) thereof, **of which the first type (E2) of region faces the adjacent light source in a perpendicular manner, and the second type (E1) of**

region also faces the adjacent light source in a perpendicular manner, under a condition that a diffusion capability of the second type of region is greater than that of the first type of region (i.e., E2<E1).

Applicant asserts that in Yokoyama, the first and second types of regions both face the adjacent light source in a perpendicular manner, under a condition that a diffusion capability of the second type is greater than that of the first type. However, in amended claim 15, the first type of region faces the adjacent light source in a perpendicular manner while the second type of region faces the adjacent light sources in an oblique manner, under a condition that a diffusion capability of the first type of region is greater than that of the second type of region. Yokoyama's structure is fundamentally different from that of the present invention, and Yokoyama does not teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that he or she might or should provide the liquid crystal display of amended claim 15. Furthermore, the liquid crystal display as recited in amended claim 15 produces new and unexpected results. That is, the "shadow" image of the light source when viewed from the liquid crystal display is eliminated. Accordingly, amended claim 15 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable over Yokoyama under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama in view of Ariyoshi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0072080 "Ariyoshi").

Claim 8 has been canceled, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

As detailed above, amended claim 9 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable over Yokoyama under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Further, applicant submits that Ariyoshi does not provide any additional teaching or suggestion to the

teachings of Yokoyama which might lead one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the liquid crystal display of amended claim 9. That is, amended claim 9 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable over Yokoyama in view of Ariyoshi under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). On this basis, claims 10-12 should be allowable as being dependent on independent amended claim 9.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama in view of Ariyoshi and in further view of Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,657 "Tanaka").

As detailed above, amended claim 9 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable over Yokoyama in view of Ariyoshi under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Further, applicant submits that Tanaka does not provide any additional teaching or suggestion to the teachings of Yokoyama and Ariyoshi which might lead one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the liquid crystal display of amended claim 9. That is, amended claim 9 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable over Yokoyama in view of Ariyoshi and in further view of Tanaka under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). On this basis, claim 13 should be allowable as being dependent on independent amended claim 9.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama in view of Ariyoshi and in further view of Lea et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,437 "Lea").

Claim 14 has been canceled, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

New claims 16 and 17 have been added, and both these claims depend indirectly from amended claim 9. Liquid crystal displays as recited in new claims

16 and 17 are described in detail in the specification of the present application. Applicant relies on the above remarks, particularly regarding amended claim 9. The new claims 16 and 17 are believed to be patentable and in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, the present application as claimed in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Charles Leu et al.

By _____
Wei Te Chung
Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137